DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 218 489 CE 033 118

AUTHOR Peterson, Kristina; Leinbach, Deborah
TITLE The Products and Uses of Research Sponsored by the Administration on Aging.
INSTITUTION American Institutes for Research in the Behavioral Sciences, Washington, DC. Gerontological Research Inst.
SPONS AGENCY Administration on Aging (DHHS), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE Jul 81
CONTRACT AoA-90-AR-2173
NOTE 53p.; Not available in paper copy due to small print.

EDRS PRICE MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS *Aging (Individuals); *Gerontology; Information Dissemination; Information Utilization; *Research Projects; *Research Utilization; *Social Science Research; Tables (Data); Trend Analysis
IDENTIFIERS *Administration on Aging; *Older Americans Act 1965

ABSTRACT

Based on information gathered from over 100 Administration on Aging-supported research, this report documents some of the products and uses of research sponsored by the Administration on Aging and supported with funds provided under Title IV-B of the Older Americans Act. Following an introductory sketch of its products, uses and users, statistics are provided concerning specific products of Title IV-B research. Examined next are the uses of Title IV-B research as well as some correlates of its use. A summary and conclusions follow. Appended to the report are procedures for data collection and analysis; National Institute of Mental Health (NIMH) final report guidelines; and a bibliography of congressional testimony, published books, television coverage, and newspaper coverage from Title IV-B support. (MN)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED218489

The Products and Uses of Research Sponsored by the Administration on Aging

Kristina Peterson
Deborah Leinbach

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

AIR Gerontological Research Inst.

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

July 1981

Gerontological Research Institute

AMERICAN INSTITUTES FOR RESEARCH
1055 Thomas Jefferson Street, NW, Washington DC 20007

CE033118

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PREFACE i

CAPSULE SUMMARY iii

I. INTRODUCTION 1

II. THE PRODUCTS OF TITLE IV-B RESEARCH 3

III. THE USES OF TITLE IV-B RESEARCH 7

IV. SOME CORRELATES OF USE 11

Number and Types of Products 12

Elapsed Time Since Project Award 17

Size of the Award 19

Nature of Grantee Institution 20

V. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS 23

APPENDIX A: Procedures for Data Collection and Analysis 25

APPENDIX B: NIMH Final Report Guidelines 33

APPENDIX C: Congressional Testimony, Published Books, Television Coverage, and Newspaper Coverage from Title IV-B Support 43

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE 1

Products and Uses of Title IV-B Research 2

TABLE 2

The Products of AoA Research 4

TABLE 3

Number of Products Per Award 5

TABLE 4

The Uses of AoA Research 8

TABLE 5

Number of Uses Per Award 11

TABLE 6

The Relationship Between the Types of Uses and the Nature of Products 12

TABLE 7

The Relationship Between Products and Uses by Congress and Practitioners 13

TABLE 8

The Relationship Between the Combination of Products and Research Applications 14

TABLE 9

The Relationship Between Final Reports and Research Applications 15

TABLE 10

The Timing of Each of the Major Types of Products and Uses 18

TABLE 11

The Relationship Between Number of Products and Size of the Award 19

TABLE 12

Size of Award and Use 20

TABLE 13

Products Per Award for University and Private Non-Profit Grantees 20

TABLE 14

Uses Per Award for University and Private Non-Profit Grantees 21

PREFACE

This report is part of a series that examines AoA's research program. The purpose here is to document some of the yield from Title IV-B funds. It is designed to complement related work of the Gerontological Research Institute (GRI) on the utilization of AoA-sponsored research, which is supported under AoA Award No. 90-AR-2173.

The information for this report was provided by over 100 AoA-supported researchers, who responded to our inquiry by sending a list of all the products from their Title IV-B research projects. Several people were also interviewed by telephone during January and February 1981. Especially helpful in this regard were Marilyn Block, Carroll Estes, Richard Douglass, Sandra Howell, and Raymond Steinberg, who provided the details for the vignettes in this report. All of the above assistance notwithstanding, the authors alone are responsible for the content of this report.

CAPSULE SUMMARY

Critics and supporters of social research programs both ask: "What is the practical utility of federally sponsored research?" This report helps to answer that question for the Administration on Aging (AoA). It summarizes the findings from a study of the products and uses of research funded under Title IV-B of the Older Americans Act.

One major finding is that final reports are only a small portion of the yield of Title IV-B funds. Our study shows that grantees produce many other products. In all, we discovered 1,149 products in a sample of 99 Title IV-B projects.

A second major finding is the extensive use to which Title IV-B research has been put. Some of the uses were made by the original researchers. Most were made by practitioners, policymakers, journalists, and others. The case for the effectiveness of AoA's research program was persuasive.

A third finding is the apparent importance of oral presentations in getting research findings used. The strong association between oral presentations and research utilization is striking. In contrast, the final report appears to be relatively unimportant in the utilization process. Projects that produced only a final report had no documented instances of utilization.

This report represents one of the few efforts that has been made to inventory the full range of products and uses of a social research program. The findings merit attention. They may help policymakers and administrators to increase the payoffs of their sponsored research.

I: INTRODUCTION

Critics and supporters of social research programs both ask: "What is the practical utility of federally sponsored research?" This report helps to answer that question for the Administration on Aging (AoA). It summarizes the findings from a study of the products and uses of research funded under Title IV-B of the Older Americans Act.

One major finding is that final reports represent only a small portion of the yield of Title IV-B funds. Final reports are not--as often assumed--the only product of research. Our study of AoA grantees shows that they produce many other products. In all, we discovered 1,149 products in a sample of 99 IV-B projects. We found 23 different types of products.

A second major finding is the extensive use to which IV-B research has been put. Some of the uses were made by the original researchers. Others were made by practitioners, policymakers, journalists, etc. We found 228 documented instances of use in the sample. We found 17 different types of applications. The numbers of products and their applications are shown in Table 1.

A third finding is the apparent importance of oral presentations in getting research findings used. We cannot determine if the oral presentations "caused" utilization, but the strong association between the two is striking. In contrast, the final report appears to be relatively unimportant in the utilization process. Projects that produced only a final report had no documented instances of utilization.

TABLE 1

Products and Uses of Title IV-B Research

Category	Number	Percent
PRODUCTS OF RESEARCH		
Written	566	49.3%
Oral	583	50.7%
TOTAL	1,149	100.0%
USES OF RESEARCH		
Uses by knowledge distributors	84	36.8%
Uses by practitioners, policymakers, other researchers	109	47.8%
Uses by original researchers	35	15.4%
TOTAL	228	100.0%

The information for this study was provided by the Title IV-B researchers who carried out these projects. We asked the investigators to send an annotated resume or a list of products and applications of their IV-B research. This report is based on responses for 99 awards, or 22 percent of the total awards made by AoA between 1968 and 1980. The procedures we used for collecting and analyzing the data are discussed in Appendix A.

This study represents one of the few times that an attempt has been made to gather information on the uses of research.[1] Because of the fundamental importance of promoting utilization in the management of research programs, such information should be assembled on a regular basis.

[1] Inquiries were made of the National Science Foundation, the National Institutes of Health, the National Institute of Justice, the National Institute of Education, the National Endowment for the Humanities, and the National Institute of Mental Health. Only the National Institute of Mental Health (NIMH) maintains a systematic information system to monitor the products and results of its research. Others require that grantees report on all of the written documents of their research, but not on the known applications. The form used by NIMH in documenting known applications and products is included in Appendix B. The information is used as a tool for describing the accomplishments of NIMH and developing new research priorities. An example is the report of NIMH's Division of Extramural Research Programs, "Major Accomplishments, 1970-1980: Priorities and Plan for Extramural Investments, FY81."

II: THE PRODUCTS OF TITLE IV-B RESEARCH

The number and variety of the products from Title IV-B research are quite large--much larger than we had expected. The 99 awards in our sample produced 202 published reports, 364 unpublished reports, and 583 oral presentations of the research results.[2] A more detailed breakdown is presented in Table 2.

The number of products per award varies from one to 74. Table 3 provides the complete distribution for the awards in our sample. Although most (67) of the awards produced ten or fewer products, the sample also includes four projects that generated over 50 products. The median number of products per award is 7.

The 202 published products include 100 journal articles and 18 books. Together, these articles and books account for ten percent of the products. (The list of books for which we have titles is provided in Appendix C.)

The 364 unpublished documents in the sample include final reports and interim reports to AoA, as well as handbooks, manuals, and other reports. They constitute 32 percent of the products. The 89 final reports are not only a minority of products (eight percent), they also are a minority of the written products (16 percent). Treating final reports as the typical product of research clearly is inappropriate.

---

[2] "Unpublished" reports include final reports. "Published" reports are only those produced by a publishing house, university press, or the U.S. Government Printing Office.

TABLE 2

The Products of AoA Research

Type of Product	Number of Products	Percent of Total Products (N = 1,149)	Number of Awards (N = 99)*
WRITTEN (UNPUBLISHED) (N = 90 Awards)			
Final Report to AoA	89	7.7	71
Interim Report to AoA	24	2.1	14
Other Reports	189	16.4	50
Handbook or Manual	49	4.3	12
Other Unpublished Material	13	1.1	7
SUBTOTAL	364	31.6	
WRITTEN (PUBLISHED OR ACCEPTED FOR PUBLICATION) (N = 57 Awards)			
Newspaper Article	7	.6	2
Newsletter Article	8	.7	5
Journal Article	100	8.7	38
Book	18	1.6	15
Chapter(s) of Book	44	3.8	22
Magazine Article	2	.2	2
Handbook or Manual	10	.9	6
Other Published Material	13	1.1	8
SUBTOTAL	202	17.6	
ORAL PRESENTATIONS (N = 75 Awards)			
Formal Conference Presentation	277	24.1	66
Other Conference Presentation	57	5.0	15
Congressional Testimony	17	1.5	12
Public Non-Federal Testimony	91	7.9	21
Other Federal Testimony (AoA, courts, etc.)	14	1.2	8
Course(s) Taught	16	1.4	7
Guest Lecturer	44	3.8	17
Media Appearance	49	4.3	10
Videotape	5	.4	3
Other	13	1.1	2
SUBTOTAL	583	50.7	

* This column lists the number of awards for which each type of product was reported.

TABLE 3

Number of Products Per Award

No. of Products	No. of Awards
1	8
2	10
3	9
4	9
5	9
6	7
7	5
8	2
9	2
10	6
11	3
12	3
13	2
16	2
17	2
18	2
19	2
20	1
21	2
24	1
29	1
31	1
32	1
34	1
35	1
37	2
42	1
51	1
53	1
60	1
74	1

There were more oral presentations of the research (51 percent) than all other products combined. This is the most common form of dissemination in the sample. It is also a kind of activity that the Gerontological Research Institute has found to be especially effective in increasing the utilization of research. In case studies of highly utilized research, a recurrent characteristic was frequent face-to-face communication between the project staff and the potential users of the research.[3]

---

[3]See Robert K. Yin and Ingrid Heinsohn, *The Uses of Research Sponsored by the Administration on Aging (AoA), Case Study No. 1: Transportation Services for the Elderly*, September 1980; Robert K. Yin and Ingrid Heinsohn, *The Uses of Research Sponsored by the Administration on Aging (AoA), Case Study No. 2: Older Americans Resources and Services (OARS)*, November 1980; and Roberta C. Cronin and Ingrid Heinsohn, *The Uses of Research Sponsored by the Administration on Aging (AoA), Case Study No. 3: Volunteer Surveys of Nursing Homes*, May 1981.

III: THE USES OF TITLE IV-B RESEARCH

The findings from Title IV-B research have been applied in numerous practical settings. The survey revealed 228 instances of use.[4] There are 84 cases of the projects being cited in the media. There are 109 cases of the research findings being used by practitioners, policymakers or other researchers. And there are 35 cases of projects leading to related research awards. Table 4 summarizes the number and diversity of research applications.

All of the major television networks have broadcast news stories based on research supported by AoA. Local stations in a number of cities--including Baltimore, Sacramento, Washington, D.C., New York City--also have featured AoA research findings. Thirteen of the 99 projects were used as a basis for newspaper stories. Both of the major wire services, as well as several leading newspapers across the country, have published articles based on Title IV-B research. One project was discussed in a *U.S. News and World Report* article. Two others were used as the basis for an article in *Newsweek*. (Appendix C gives details on the projects that received media attention.)

---

[4]The data on uses of Title IV-B research are likely to be underestimates of actual use. For various reasons, researchers are often unaware of all the instances in which their research findings are applied. Also, our coding procedures were designed to avoid over-counting. If the respondent reported, for example, that the research had been used by several different researchers as the basis for other research, only one "use" was coded. Only if the uses were clearly different were they coded more than once.

TABLE 4

The Uses of AoA Research

Type of Use	Number of Uses	Percent of Total (N = 228)	Number of Awards (N = 99)*
USES BY KNOWLEDGE DISTRIBUTORS (N = 19 Awards)			
Newspaper article (by others)	50	21.9	13
Newsletter article	11	4.8	5
Magazine article	3	1.3	3
TV or Radio Coverage (not involving appearances)	13	5.7	4
Other	7	3.1	5
SUBTOTAL	84	36.8	
USES BY PRACTITIONERS, POLICYMAKERS, OTHER RESEARCHERS (N = 32 Awards)			
Cited in Others' Courses	7	3.1	4
Contributed to or Cited in Other Researchers' Work	31	13.6	19
Used as a Basis for a Conference	9	3.9	6
Used as a Basis for Legislative Action (Federal)	5	2.2	5
Used as a Basis for Legislative Action (Non-Federal)	12	5.3	5
Used as a Basis for New or Different Practices in Program Management or Personnel Training by Practitioners	41	18.0	18
Used by AoA for Subsequent Research Agenda	3	1.3	2
Other	1	.4	1
SUBTOTAL	109	47.8	
USES BY ORIGINAL RESEARCHERS (N = 16 Awards)			
Follow-on Grant from AoA	8	3.5	8
Related Grant from Another Agency	16	7.0	9
Related Grant from AoA	5	2.2	4
Other	6	2.6	3
SUBTOTAL	35	15.3	

* This column lists the number of awards for which each type of use was reported.

One third of the project staffs (32 of 99) report that their findings have been used by practitioners, policymakers or other researchers. Of these, the largest number of uses is 41 "contributions to new or different practices in program management or personnel training." Some illustrative examples of such uses are:[5]

- The Ft. Lincoln Family Medicine Center and the D.C. General Hospital used the findings from a Georgetown University project ("Maintaining the Elderly in the Community," 90A1381) to develop training courses and assessment procedures for the elderly.

- The Department of Labor and the Social Security Administration used the findings from an Urban Institute project ("The Adequacy of Private Pensions," 90A1652) to develop policy positions on income security.

- A nursing home in Missouri has adopted the recommendations for modifying policy and practice provided by a University of Missouri project ("Environmental Constraints on Spatial Organization of Social Interaction," 90AR2058).

- The Area Agency on Aging in Kansas City, Missouri, used the data from a University of Missouri project ("Urban and Rural Differences Among Hispanic Aged," 90AR2077) to train its employees.

- Numerous social service agencies in California used the findings on program development of a California State University project ("Techniques of Social Service Provision to the Minority Aged," 90A1832 and 90A1298).

---

[5]Other examples may be found in the three case studies cited above.

- The California Multi-Service Senior Program adopted recommendations on program management provided by a University of Southern California project ("Research Dissemination and Utilization," 90A319).

A number of Title IV-B projects led to applications in both policy and practice. Some of the ways that Title IV-B research has been used are illustrated in the following vignette:

Vignette No. 1

A Massachusetts Institute of Technology project, directed by Dr. Sandra Howell, surveyed elderly living in subsidized housing to determine their preferred living environment. Among the principal findings are that (1) the elderly prefer separate rooms to large, multi-purpose rooms, (2) they have more furniture than other people, (3) their needs sometimes require two bedrooms, and (4) they prefer small community rooms.

The research has led to applications in both policy and practice. As a direct result of the project's findings, the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) changed its floorplan designs. New housing contains one-bedroom apartments with an average of 100 more square feet and smaller, more numerous community rooms. Further, the State of Massachusetts now requires that five to eight percent of all HUD-subsidized housing units contain two bedrooms.

Architects not associated with HUD have also applied the findings to their designs. Howell's suggestions affected construction in Maverick Square, East Boston, and the remodeling of Glouchester Elementary School in Boston for use by the elderly.

During the latter stages of the project, 20 architects participated with Howell in a pilot study of knowledge transfer. The architects were from private architectural firms, state housing agencies, a State Agency on Aging, and a city planning department. Howell presented the project's findings to the group, and provided technical assistance as they designed new housing. The architects incorporated the project's findings into their final designs.

IV: SOME CORRELATES OF USE

The number of uses reported for the projects in our sample ranged from none to 29, as shown in Table 5. In another study, we are identifying the factors that account for these large differences (with special emphasis on the factors that AoA or the grantees may be able to control). We have studied Title IV-B projects that have led to extremely high rates of utilization; some common patterns have emerged.[6]

TABLE 5
Number of Uses Per Award

Reported Uses	No. of Awards
0	57
1	7
2	12
3	4
4	2
5	1
6	5
7	2
8	1
9	3
10	1
14	2
26	1
29	1

[6] See the three case studies cited above.

The present data base does not permit comparable analyses. Its focus is limited to incidents of use. It does not provide the rich detail the case studies afford about the context in which the research was conducted, or the special efforts made by AoA and the grantees to promote the application of results. We can, however, examine the relationships among projects, products, and uses at a descriptive level, with a view to developing hypotheses that AoA may wish to pursue. In this chapter, we discuss four kinds of relationships and some possible implications.

Number and Types of Products

We begin with the overall relationship between products and uses. Table 6 shows the "profile" of products (published documents, unpublished documents, and oral presentations) associated with the projects that did or did not lead to practical applications. Projects that did result in use were more prolific than the others in producing each of the three types of products. The difference in the number of oral presentations is especially striking.

TABLE 6
The Relationship Between the Types of Uses and the Nature of Products

	MEAN NUMBER OF PRODUCTS PRODUCED BY PROJECTS THAT WERE:			
TYPE OF PRODUCT	Used by Knowledge Distributors (N = 19 awards)	Used by Practitioners, Policymakers, Other Researchers (N = 32 awards)	Used by Original Researchers (N = 16 awards)	Not Used (N = 57 awards)
Published Documents	1.8	2.9	3.8	1.5
Unpublished Documents	4.9	5.3	5.6	2.8
Oral Presentations	8.7	12.1	14.8	2.7
TOTAL	15.4	20.3	24.0	7.0

We cannot assume that the preparation of a large number of products "causes" utilization. Causation works both ways. Projects that have sufficient intrinsic interest or merit to attract the attention of the media, policymakers, practitioners, and other researchers are also those that most readily lend them-

selves to publishable articles or books, and that are most likely to stimulate invitations to conferences or Congressional hearings. But the magnitude of the differences between used and unused research suggests that this is not the only dynamic at work. The relationships shown in Table 6 can be construed as highly supportive of AoA's recent emphasis on dissemination on the part of its grantees.

To explore this issue further, we looked specifically at the two kinds of uses that are most directly related to impact on the elderly: use in federal legislation, and use by practitioners. In all, 18 of the projects in our sample resulted in one or both of these uses. In Table 7, the number of products produced by these projects is compared with the number of products from studies that did not result in either of these uses. The differences are not large for written products. But, for oral presentations, the difference is substantial. Studies that were used by Congress or by practitioners were associated with three times as many oral presentations as those that were not applied to legislation or practice.

TABLE 7
The Relationship Between Products and Uses by Congress and Practitioners

TYPE OF PRODUCT	MEAN NUMBER OF PRODUCTS PRODUCED BY PROJECTS THAT WERE: Used by Congress or Practitioners (N = 18 awards)	Used by Neither Congress Nor Practitioners (N = 81 awards)
Published Documents	2.7	1.9
Unpublished Documents	3.5	3.7
Oral Presentations	12.8	4.3
TOTAL	19.0	10.0

In Table 8, we examine the variations in use associated with different "profiles" or configurations of products. Four categories are considered: Projects that generated all three types of products (published materials, unpublished reports, and oral presentations), projects that omitted published materials,

projects that omitted oral presentations, and projects that omitted both published materials and oral presentations.[7]

TABLE 8
The Relationship Between the Combination of Products and Research Applications

TYPE OF USE	MEAN NUMBER OF USES OF PROJECTS THAT PRODUCED: All Three (N = 43 awards)	Oral & Unpublished (N = 26 awards)	Published & Unpublished (N = 7 awards)	Unpublished Only (N = 14 awards)
Used by Knowledge Distributors	1.4	1.0	0.0	0.0
Used by Practitioners, Policymakers, Other Researchers	2.0	.7	0.0	0.0
Used by Original Researchers	.7	.2	0.0	0.0
TOTAL	4.1	1.8	0.0	0.0

The results provide further insights into the relationship between the nature of research products and the incidence of use. There is a strong association between the production of published materials and all three types of use (Column 1 vs. Column 2). More to the point, there is no reported use whatever of projects that produced no oral presentations (Columns 3 and 4).

Finally, we turn to the classic product of federal research grants, the final project report. When we isolate this category, what are the characteristics of use? The results are shown in Table 9. The answer seems to be that the final report alone contributes very little to use. This is shown by the comparison of projects that did and did not produce final reports, and accentuated by the findings for projects that produced *only* a final report.

[7] For four awards, we were unable to identify any unpublished product. Since all grants are associated with some sort of requirement for a report to AoA (unpublished), we chose to treat these four as examples of incomplete data rather than as examples of projects that produce no unpublished materials at all.

TABLE 9
The Relationship Between Final Reports and Research Applications

TYPE OF USE	MEAN NUMBER OF USES OF PROJECTS THAT PRODUCED: Final Report & Other Products (N = 62)	Only Other Products (N = 28)	Only a Final Report (N = 9)
Used by Knowledge Distributors	1.3	.1	0.0
Used by Practitioners, Policymakers, Other Researchers	1.2	1.2	0.0
Used by Original Researchers	.4	.4	0.0
TOTAL	2.8	1.8	0.0

These data suggest that the importance of the final research report has been overstated. They do *not* suggest that final reports cannot play a highly effective role when supplemented by other means of dissemination. This is illustrated by the following vignette:

Vignette No. 2

The Institute of Gerontology at the University of Michigan completed a 14-month research project in 1980, supported jointly by AoA and the Michigan Department of Social Services. The work documented the extent and severity of abuse of the elderly, an under-investigated subject prior to that time. The project was directed by Dr. Richard Douglass.

Among the products of the research are a final report, four conference papers and a newsletter article. Uses of the research include an article in *Newsweek* and an interview on the radio program *Voice of America*. There have been more than 1,200 requests for the final report, and hundreds of requests for the conference papers.

The research has been used by policymakers, practitioners and community leaders. At least 20 state legislatures have requested the project reports to help develop legislation for mandatory reporting of elderly abuse. The states include Indiana, Ohio, California, and Michigan. Douglass has given testimony before three state legislatures, and commented on draft legislation for several states.

The project has also led to concrete innovations in practice settings. In Inkster, Michigan, the director of the local Retired Senior Volunteer Program was inspired by the final report to develop a community task force on senior citizen abuse. The group, composed of 17 representatives from local organizations concerned with the elderly, refers local residents to appropriate social service agencies. In the

future, the task force plans to establish a volunteer peer counseling service in housing units for the elderly. There have also been similar programs established in other states, including New York and Ohio, as a result of this research.

The more typical pattern--i.e., uses in which products other than the final report play the key role--is illustrated by the following vignette:

Vignette No. 3

A University of California project, directed by Dr. Carroll Estes, evaluated the implementation of AoA policy at the State and Area level. The research has contributed to 71 products and applications.

The project contributed to three unpublished reports and 13 published documents. The published documents include two books *(The Aging Enterprise* and *Technocratic de la Viellesse)*, three special reports to Congress, three book chapters, and five journal articles. Estes was also the guest editor for the *Generations* special issue, "Public Policy" (published in May 1980).

The project was particularly active in giving oral presentations. Estes gave testimony four times before the U.S. House of Representatives Subcommittee on Labor-HEW Appropriations. She also testified twice before the U.S. House of Representatives Select Committee on Aging, and nine times before other federal and state level officials. She also organized and was the chairperson for the "House and Senate Staff Conference on Research and Training: Views from the National Institute on Aging (NIA) and National Institute of Mental Health (NIMH)."

In addition, project staff presented 14 papers at professional society meetings, including the International Gerontological Association and the International Sociological Association. Estes conducted seminars based partially on the research at Georgia State University, guest lectured for three other courses, made five media appearances, and gave the keynote address at the Gray Panthers Third Biennial National Convention.

In addition to these direct products, the research led to innovations in policy and practice settings. State and Area Agencies changed their planning cycles partially due to the research findings. Further, the relationship between the California Department of Health Services and the California Department of Aging was formalized in an attempt to improve the planning process in community health services. The research also contributed to the Older Californians Act, the California equivalent to the Older Americans Act. The project received one follow-on grant from AoA and four related grants from other agencies.

Elapsed Time Since Project Award

A second set of relationships concerns the time lag associated with the various products and uses. Table 10 shows the relevant data.[8] It will be seen that:

- Unpublished documents and oral presentations follow highly similar production schedules; published reports lag behind these by roughly two years.

- In the first three years following the grant award, the uses that are made of the research are predominantly uses by knowledge distributors.

- Extensive use by practitioners, policymakers, and other researchers begins in the third year following the award and continues through the sixth; uses by the project staff in developing follow-up projects follow a similar pattern.

This sequence reinforces the findings in related research that interactions between researchers and potential users during the early stages of a project are important factors in utilization.[9] The aggregate trend suggests that products precede applications. Findings orally presented are communicated through knowledge distributors fairly quickly; applications to policy and practice follow in subsequent years.

The cumulative percentages in Table 10 have implications also for the procedures used in reviewing research projects. They indicate which of the many types of products and uses can be expected at a given point in time. (Data on the relative lengths of these projects would refine these expectations.) Our findings suggest that a wide array of other products should be reviewed in addition to the final report, and that a reasonable assessment

---

[8]This section discusses aggregate trends. It would have been interesting to examine the effects separately for projects of varying lengths. However, this information was unavailable.

[9]See the three case studies cited above.

TABLE 10
The Timing of Each of the Major Types of Products and Uses

	PRODUCTS OF THE RESEARCH						USES OF THE RESEARCH					
	Published Documents		Unpublished Documents		Oral Presentations		Knowledge Distributors		Practitioners, Policymakers, Other Researchers		Original Researchers	
Time Lag* (in years)	No. of Products	Cumulative %	No. of Products	Cumulative %	No. of Products	Cumulative %	No. of Uses	Cumulative %	No. of Uses	Cumulative %	No. of Uses	Cumulative %
1	3	2.0	4	2.2	24	5.3	6	18.8	3	6.0	2	9.5
2	19	15.0	65	37.9	129	33.8	13	59.4	9	24.0	4	28.6
3	24	31.3	60	70.9	154	67.8	12	96.9	15	54.0	4	47.6
4	35	55.1	27	85.7	76	84.5	1	100.0	9	72.0	1	52.4
5	32	76.9	11	91.8	38	92.9	0	100.0	5	82.0	2	95.2
6	12	85.0	7	95.6	12	95.6	0	100.0	8	98.0	0	95.2
7	8	90.5	6	98.9	10	97.8	0	100.0	1	100.0	1	100.0
8	8	95.9	2	100.0	7	99.3	0	100.0	0	100.0	0	100.0
9	4	98.6	0	100.0	3	100.0	0	100.0	0	100.0	0	100.0
10	2	100.0	0	100.0	0	100.0	0	100.0	0	100.0	0	100.0
TOTAL**	147	100.0	182	100.0	453	100.0	32	100.0	50	100.0	21	100.0

* Time lag is the number of years after the award is made. Thus the data for a time lag of one year represent the number of products or uses that were generated during the first year of the award.

** Data were available for 782 of the products and 103 of the incidents of use.

cannot be made until the third year after the award. A *complete* review of a project could not occur--for the average project--until at least the fifth year after the award.

Size of the Award

A third characteristic that is included in our data base (for 88 of the 99 projects) is the size of the award. We examined first the relationship between size of award and number of products. The results are shown in Table 11. As would be expected, the larger awards are associated with larger numbers of products. The two largest awards (of $1.0 million and $0.9 million) generated 57 and 74 products, respectively; the 27 other "large" awards (which ranged from $204,000 to $547,000) generated an average of 15.4 separate products.

TABLE 11

The Relationship Between Number of Products and Size of the Award

Size of the Award*	No. of Products	Mean
Small (N = 29)	186	6.4
Medium (N = 30)	296	9.9
Large (N = 29)	596	20.6

* Small = Under $75,000
Medium = $75,000 – $200,000
Large = Over $200,000

This positive relationship does *not* extend to use. As will be seen from the tabulation in Table 12, there is no consistent relationship between incidence of use and size of award. Indeed, the medium-size awards result in the greatest use in this particular sample.

TABLE 12
Size of Award and Use

Size of the Award	AVERAGE NO. OF USES BY: Knowledge Distributors	Practitioners, Policymakers, Other Researchers	Original Researchers
Small (N = 29)	0.7	0.9	0.3
Medium (N = 30)	1.1	1.6	0.3
Large (N = 29)	0.8	1.0	0.3

Nature of Grantee Institution

The final characteristic we examined was the institutional affiliation of the grantee. Specifically, we compared awards to universities with awards to non-profit research institutions with respect to both products and use. There were 60 awards to universities and 31 to non-profit research institutions; the other eight awards were to public or social service agencies (6) and to private foundations (2).

TABLE 13
Products Per Award for University and Private Non-Profit Grantees

	University Grantees (N = 60)	Non-Profit Grantees (N = 31)
Published	2.8	1.1
Unpublished	3.8	3.7
Oral	8.1	1.6

The results with respect to the number of products per award are shown in Table 13. The two groups of grantees were equally prolific in producing unpublished documents. But, in each of the other two categories, the difference is large. Researchers at universities, when compared to those in non-profit research firms, produced per award:

- twice as many published journal articles,

- three times as many oral presentations,
- three times as many formal conference presentations,
- five times as many chapters in published books,
- six times as many informal conference presentations, and
- ten times as many public, non-federal testimonies.

These findings are consistent with the heavy emphasis on publications and professional visibility in university settings.

TABLE 14
Uses Per Award for University and Private Non-Profit Grantees

Instances of Use	University Grantees (N = 60)	Non-Profit Grantees (N = 31)
By Knowledge Distributors	1.1	0.5
By Practitioners, Policymakers, Other Researchers	1.6	0.2
By Original Researchers	0.4	0.3

The differences in incidence of use are equally striking. These are shown in Table 14. Projects that were carried out at universities received twice as much coverage by knowledge distributors, and led to eight times as many applications by practitioners, policymakers and other researchers. Some of the specific findings of interest are that the 60 university-based projects produced:

- 40 newspaper articles, and
- 38 adoptions of new or different approaches by practitioners.

The picture that emerges from these data is not at all consistent with the stereotype of aloof scholars exploring esoteric topics.

The apparent difference between the products developed at the two kinds of institutions must be interpreted cautiously. It well may be that a factor other than the nature of the institution--e.g., a difference in the types of research carried out by the two kinds of institutions--underlies the findings. But the fact that university-based research is used much more widely than some believe is real.

V: SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

This report represents one of the few efforts that has been made to inventory the full range of products and uses of a social research program. The findings merit attention. Some common assumptions about research were reinforced by the data. Others were contradicted.

The question that began the study was: What is the practical utility of federally sponsored research? The focus of our interest was the discrete instances of utilization. The findings reveal that uses occur in larger numbers than might have been predicted. There were 41 documented instances of use by practitioners. There were 17 documented instances of use in the legislative process. Doubtless there were many other undocumented cases fostered by the extensive media coverage these projects received. In these and other types of use, the case for the effectiveness of AoA's research program was persuasive.

The findings on the role of the final report also differ from the commonly held assumptions. We found that final reports constitute only eight percent of the products in the sample. In addition to final reports, the projects produced 477 other written products and 583 oral presentations. Moreover, our data point to the relatively minor role of the final report in the utilization of research. Final reports can play an effective role when combined with other products. But the projects in the samples that produced only final reports led to no practical applications.

In contrast to the findings on the final report, our analyses indicate that oral presentations are closely associated with research utilization. Projects that had been used by Congress or practitioners, for example, were presented orally three times

more often than projects that were not used in these ways. The timing of events reinforces this link. Oral presentations tended to occur prior to the reported applications of the research. This is consistent with findings in related research on the importance of interactions between researchers and potential users during the early stages of a project. Such interactions appear to enhance the likelihood that research will be used in policy or practice.

Our data also suggest that research conducted in "the halls of ivy" is by no means limited to abstract, theoretical exercises. Indeed, the projects carried out by universities generate a larger number of products and are used more often by practitioners than the projects carried out by other institutions. This finding is not surprising, given the incentive structure. Universities encourage their staff to write journal articles and publishable materials. The fact that a research project has ended does not affect these incentives. More vigorous dissemination of research results outside the university setting may require incentives.

The study also showed that different kinds of products and uses occurred at different times, over a period of six or more years. This casts doubt on the conventional practice of evaluating research on the basis of the final report submitted at the end of the grant. If one purpose of the evaluation is to extract *all* useful information, an adequate review would encompass all of the products noted in this report, and could not reasonably be undertaken until the third year after the award. A comprehensive review could not be undertaken until after the fifth year.

These findings are only suggestive. But they would seem to be sufficiently provocative to encourage future data collection on these topics. More complete data would provide better samples and more reliable analyses. In particular, procedures should be established by the major sponsors of research to monitor such data on a continuing basis. The National Institute of Mental Health's procedure for collecting information on its sponsored research could serve as a model. Collecting the data would be relatively inexpensive. The results could help policymakers and administrators to increase the payoffs of their sponsored research.

APPENDIX A: Procedures for Data Collection and Analysis

Notes on Data Collection Procedures

Of the 441 research awards made by AoA from 1968 through 1980, names and addresses were available for 193 different investigators, covering 231 awards. (Some of the researchers had more than one award.) Some of the letters had incorrect or inadequate addresses, and we ultimately received a total of 99 responses out of the 154 letters "accurately" sent. The response rate for correct mailings, therefore, was 65 percent.

We telephoned a random sample of 13 of our non-respondents to determine if those who responded represented a special category of researchers. They did not. When asked their reason for not responding, eight said that they had been too busy, three had asked someone else to help respond, one never received our letter, and one said the project was over but had never produced anything.

We were also unable to use the information for 22 of the awards for which we received a response. Eight were eliminated because the respondent(s) said that the project was ongoing and they could not yet predict the full range of products. Fourteen were eliminated because the information provided was too vague to use.

Sample Letter to IV-B Researchers

AMERICAN INSTITUTES FOR RESEARCH
IN THE BEHAVIORAL SCIENCES
1055 Thomas Jefferson Street, NW, Washington, DC 20007 ● 202 342 5000

(Date)

(Address)

Re: (Title and Award Number of Project)

Dear _____:

The Office of Research, Demonstration and Evaluation, Administration on Aging, made an award to the American Institutes for Research (AIR), to establish a Gerontological Research Institute. One of AIR's tasks is to conduct an external review of IV-B research products. The results of the review are intended to assist AoA in planning for the utilization and dissemination of IV-B research reports and findings. The first step in conducting the review is to develop a comprehensive inventory of IV-B products and the external uses of these products.

Because research findings are packaged in a variety of ways and disseminated and used by multiple audiences, AoA is not always aware of the full impact of a IV-B project. We know, for example, that some of the more important research findings are presented at professional conferences or in testimony before state and federal legislators rather than in final reports. But we often hear of these activities only through informal channels. To ensure that the full spectrum of IV-B research products, activities, and uses can be included in the external review, we hope to enlist your cooperation in identifying the outcomes of this research.

We are interested in two types of information--(1) direct products of your IV-B research, such as reports, presentations and journal articles and (II) external uses of these products, such as media coverage or the citation of the research by others. The following lists are provided to assist you in reviewing the overall products, activities and uses of this research. The items are suggestive rather than exhaustive. Please include in your response all of the appropriate items, regardless of whether they fit the categories given on the following page.

Direct Products of the Research

- Journal article or other major publication
- Manuscript submitted for publication
- Final or interim IV-B report
- Book or book chapter
- Presentation at professional conference
- How-to manual, instruments, tests
- Testimony before federal or state legislators
- Testimony before federal, state, area or local agencies (agencies on aging or other human service agencies)

External Uses of Research Findings

- Citations by other researchers
- Media coverage (press, radio, television or popular magazine)
- Practitioner use of findings (e.g., program development or modification of policy or practice)
- Contributions to further research
- Follow-on grant award
- Legislative use of findings
- Adoption of recommendations

We assume that most of these items are listed on your current vita. You need only send us a copy, with the appropriate items marked. If there are any items not on the vita please list them. For your convenience, we have enclosed a stamped envelope addressed to AIR.

Please note that we are writing to you as the Principal Investigator of record. If responsibility for the project has been transferred to another individual, we would appreciate your forwarding this letter to the appropriate person.

Sincerely,

Robert K. Yin
Director
Gerontological Research Institute

RKY/jb

Characteristics of the Sample

The projects included in this analysis are not necessarily representative of all Title IV-B projects.[1] It is impossible to ascertain the characteristics of those projects for which we received no response. And we do not have complete information on all of the IV-B projects that would provide an estimate of sample bias. The 99 awards examined here should not, therefore, be considered a representative sample of all IV-B projects, in the traditional sense of that term.

The extent to which our sample does not cover specific categories of projects can be seen in Tables A-C. The distribution of projects by the year of the first award is given for both the projects included in our sample and all Title IV-B projects. The proportions are similar for most of the years, but the sample over-represents the recent years (1976 through 1979), and under-represents earlier years (1966-1969, 1971 and 1974). Similarly, the 99 awards do not reflect exactly the distribution of the award amounts for all Title IV-B projects. The award amounts of the projects in our sample are generally higher. Thirty percent of the 99 awards were for over $200,000 while only 15 percent of all Title IV-B awards were in this category.

One characteristic that is more accurately represented by the sample is the proportion of projects conducted by the various categories of research organizations. The organization conducting the research is classified as one of five types:

- university or other institution of higher education,
- non-profit research firm,
- profit-making research firm,
- public agency or social service agency, or

[1] We use the terms "award" and "project" interchangeably in this report for convenience. We know that some projects had more than one award (e.g., the Duke OARS project had two). When we were aware of such cases, we used only one of the award numbers to identify the project for this sample. It is possible, though, that the number of awards discussed in this report is slightly higher than the number of projects actually represented by them.

- private foundation.

In both cases, over half of the awards represented were conducted by university researchers, about seven percent by public or social service agencies, and 22 to 30 percent by non-profit research firms. Only the profit-making research firms are unrepresented in the sample.

A. Distribution of Awards, by Year of Award

Year of Award*	PERCENT OF AWARDS	
	Awards in Sample (N = 99)	All Awards (N = 441)
1966	0%	1%
1967	0	3
1968	1	2
1969	1	2
1970	2	2
1971	1	3
1972	2	0
1973	2	0
1974	2	5
1975	8	6
1976	18	10
1977	16	7
1978	15	12
1979	23	13
1980	0	5
Unknown	9	29
TOTAL	100%	100%

* Award years were unknown for 9 of the awards in the sample, and 128 of the total. We suspect that the unknown years fall primarily before 1975, when AoA's record keeping procedures changed.

B. Distribution of Awards, by Size of Award

Amount of Award	PERCENT OF AWARDS	
	Awards in Sample (N = 99)	All Awards (N = 441)
Under $100,000	35%	27%
$100,000 – 199,999	24	19
$200,000 – 299,999	18	9
$300,000 – 399,999	3	3
$400,000 – 499,999	5	2
$500,000 and over	3	1
Unknown	11	38
TOTAL	100%	100%

C. Distribution of Awards by Type of Organization

Type of Organization	PERCENT OF AWARDS	
	Awards in Sample (N = 99)	All Awards (N = 441)
University	61%	55%
Non-Profit Research Firm	31	22
Profit-Making Research Firm	0	2
Public or Social Service Agency	6	6
Private Foundation	2	4
Unknown	1	12
TOTAL	100%	100%

APPENDIX B: NIMH Final Report Guidelines

FORM APPROVED
OMB NO. 68-R1452

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE
PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF MENTAL HEALTH
DIVISION OF EXTRAMURAL RESEARCH PROGRAMS

FINAL REPORT GUIDELINES

Month Year
(01) (02) (03) (04)

INSTRUCTIONS

PHS policy requires that grantees submit a "terminal progress report" (final report) within 90 days after completion of the grant.

Please complete this series of items *as this final report.* The report will be filed with your applications, reports and other grant business in NIMH's central files. It will be read by staff in research program areas, and may be read by other Institute staff concerned with program analysis, communication, evaluation and planning. The report will be used for information about your research, i.e., to describe and summarize the information *(procedural as well as substantive)* resulting from NIMH support, and to relate that information to mental health problems and research. Your report will often be used apart from your application; however, other documents, such as publications and applications, will be available from the project file if needed.

These guidelines have been designed with relatively small response spaces to encourage brevity. However, do not restrict your response if more space is needed; be complete, using additional labeled pages inserted where necessary *(sample page included).* Extensive descriptions and discussions, if desired, should be made *in addition to* your summary response to the item, and should be placed as appendices. Discussions of issues not covered by these guidelines are also welcome as appendices. Use clear, concise language, avoiding highly technical language *where practicable (this will vary for different types of research);* appendices could be more technical than responses to the items.

All publications resulting from this project, and not previously submitted, should be submitted with this report *(or as soon as available);* see the section on Dissemination. Publications should *not* be used in lieu of responses to particular items.

Send copies of this report and all appendices as indicated below.

Small Grants *(RO3's)*
Send 20 Copies *

All Other Grants
Send 3 copies *

FOR NIMH USE ONLY

TO Mental Health Services Development Branch
Division of Mental Health Service Programs
National Institute of Mental Health
5600 Fishers Lane, Room 11C-17
Rockville, Maryland 20857

* *Send two copies only of any books published.*

Branch/Section ___ ___ - ___

ADMINISTRATIVE DATA: (NOTE: *If items 1-4 have changed, give the latest information*)	1. GRANT NUMBER (05) (06) (07) (08) (09) (10) (11) (12) (13) (14) — M H	2. TITLE OF GRANT
	3. NAME OF PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR	4. SPONSORING INSTITUTION
	SIGNATURE OF PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR	5. NAME AND POSITION OF PERSON WRITING THIS REPORT IF OTHER THAN ITEM 3

ADM 442
Rev. 2-76

CONTINUE ON REVERSE SIDE

GRANT NUMBER

AIMS OF THE PROJECT:

(PROBLEM STUDIED)

6. Describe briefly the *specific aims* of your project, indicating major changes in direction from the original aims:

7. Were the aims pursued as *originally formulated?*

1 ☐ Yes
2 ☐ No
(19)

TYPE OF RESEARCH:

8. In general, how would you *characterize* your research?
(Rank any multiple answers, using "1" as most appropriate)

(16) ☐ Hypothesis development
(17) ☐ Hypothesis testing
(18) ☐ Development or refinement of methodology
(19) ☐ Gathering of data; e.g., surveys
(20) ☐ Other *(Specify)*:

GRANT NUMBER:

CONDUCT OF RESEARCH

9. Describe the *methodology* used in your research, including characteristics of any sample used:

10. Did you have significant *technical methodological* difficulties?
(Examples: necessary measurement tools undeveloped; unexpected inadequate data base)
If yes, describe, and explain how you dealt with them.

1 ☐ Yes
2 ☐ No (31)

11. Did you have significant *practical operational* difficulties?
(Examples: trouble with equipment; loss of sample or data; difficulties with cooperating units)
If yes, describe, and explain how you dealt with them.

1 ☐ Yes
2 ☐ No (33)

GRANT NUMBER:

12. Describe (a) your *conclusions* or *results* as they relate to your specific aims *(please include negative results)*, and (b) their *significance* in relation to the field. Avoid highly technical language where practicable.

RESULTS:

GRANT NUMBER:

RESULTS
(Continued)

13. Did you have *other findings* not directly related to the specific aims *("seren lipitous findings")*?
If yes, describe:

1 ☐ Yes (23)
2 ☐ No

14. How do the *overall results* of your project fit into these descriptions?
(If you had multiple expectations or hypotheses, base your response on the predominant trend of the results).

☐ Confirming your hypotheses or expectations (24)
☐ Disproving your hypotheses or expectations (25)
☐ Inconclusive (26)

15. Did your research result in significant *methodological developments*?
If yes, describe:

1 ☐ Yes (27)
2 ☐ No

GRANT NUMBER:

IMPLICATIONS:

16. How would you describe the *impact* of your project?
(Rank any multiple answers, using "1" as most appropriate)

(28) ☐ Opening up a new line of research
(29) ☐ Contributing to the knowledge base of the field
(30) ☐ Providing facts ready for application in a field
(31) ☐ Indicative of a "dead-end" line of pursuit

17. Do you have immediate plans for *further research* in this area? 1 ☐ Yes (32) 2 ☐ No
If yes, describe:

18. Beyond your own plans, what is your opinion of the future directions this research area should take?

19. Do you have *specific suggestions (experiments, cautions, etc.)* for other research in this area? 1 ☐ Yes (33) 2 ☐ No
If yes, describe:

GRANT NUMBER

IMPLICATIONS *(Continued)*

20. In services R & D we are particularly interested in any practice or policy utilization of your findings - not by researchers but by service providers. Are you aware of uses of your findings? If yes, describe, and check the type of impact which best characterizes the impact of your research at this time. Please use continuation page if appropriate.

1 ☐ Yes
2 ☐ No

☐ Specific utilization
☐ General field impact

DISSEMINATION:

21. As an appendix, list *all publications (and articles accepted for publication)* resulting from this project. Send any publications which have not already been submitted as appendices, with grant number indicated on each. *(See instructions, page 1, regarding submission of books)*

22. Did you engage in any activities to promote the diffusion and utilization of your project results? Examples of such activities are speeches, conferences, action consultations, etc. If yes, please describe and/or list each activity. Please use continuation page if appropriate.

1 ☐ Yes
2 ☐ No

23. The official PHS policy indicates that if results incorporated in the report have been submitted for publication but not yet published, contents of the report will, as far as possible, be held as restricted information for six months unless the investigator agrees to an earlier release. Do you request this restriction?

1 ☐ Yes
2 ☐ No (38)

APPENDICES:

See instructions, page 1, paragraph 3.

FINAL REPORT GUIDELINES CONTINUATION PAGE	GRANT NUMBER

Item No. _____

APPENDIX C: **Congressional Testimony, Published Books, Television Coverage, and Newspaper Coverage from Title IV-B Support**

I. CONGRESSIONAL TESTIMONY

Bellos, N.S. Testimony before the U.S. Senate, Special Committee on Aging, October 1969.

Block, M. "Domestic Violence and the Older Woman." U.S. Senate, Committee on Domestic Violence, Boston, MA, April 1979.

Block, M. "Protection from Domestic Violence." U.S. Senate Committee on Judicial Proceedings, Annapolis, MD, March 1979.

Brody, E.M. Testimony to the U.S. House of Representatives, Select Committee on Aging, June 4, 1980.

Clark, R.L. "Early Retirement Incentives and Government Policies." Hearings before the U.S. House of Representatives, Committee on Ways and Means, Subcommittee on Oversight, September 10, 1980.

Cowgill, D.O. "The Future Location of the Elderly Population Within Metropolitan Areas." Statement at the Joint Hearing before the U.S. House of Representatives, Select Committee on Population and the Select Committee on Aging on the Consequences of Changing U.S. Population: Demographics of Aging, May 24, 1978.

Cunningham, C. "Crimes Against the Aging." Testimony before the U.S. Senate, Joint Congressional Committee, Special Committee on Aging and the U.S. House of Representatives, Select Committee on Aging, February 1978.

Gerbner, G., Gross, L., Signorielli, N., & Morgan, M. "Aging with Television: What Viewers See and What They See." U.S. House of Representatives, Select Committee on Aging, Los Angeles Hearing, April 26, 1980.

Raitano, I. Testimony before the U.S. Senate, Committee on Funding for Family Care of Chronically Ill Family Members.

Revis, J. "Home Care Services for Older Americans: Planning for the Future." Testimony before the U.S. Senate Special Committee on Aging, May 1979.

Schmidt, W. "Health Care for Older Americans: The 'Alternatives' Issue." Testimony before the U.S. Senate, Special Committee on Aging, 95th Congress, 1st Session, November 23, 1977.

Steinberg, R. Testimony at hearings for the reauthorization of the Older Americans Act, U.S. Senate, Human Resources Committee, Subcommittee on Aging, 1978.

Storey, J. Testimony to the U.S. House of Representatives, Ways and Means Subcommittee on Oversight, September 10, 1980.

II. PUBLISHED BOOKS

Dowd, J.J. *Stratification Among the Aged: An Analysis of Power and Dependency.* Monterey, CA: Brooks Cole, 1980.

Fogel, R., Hatfield, E., Kiesler, S., & Shanas, E. (Eds.) *Aging: The Family, Stability and Change.* New York: Academic Press, forthcoming.

Gilbert, N. & Specht, H. *Coordination of Social Services: An Analysis of Community Organizational and Staff Characteristics.* New York: Praeger, 1977.

Holmes, M. & Holmes, D. (Eds.) *The Handbook of Human Services for Older Persons.* New York: Human Sciences Press, 1979.

Kutza, E.A. *The Benefits of Old Age: Social Welfare Policies for the Elderly.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1981.

Lawton, M.P. *Community Housing Choices for Older Americans.* New York: Springer Publishing Co., 1981.

Lehner, T.J. *The Older Americans, Issues in State Services.* Lexington, KY: The Council of State Governments.

Sager, A. *Planning Home Care for the Elderly.* Cambridge, MA: Ballinger, 1981.

Schmidt, W.C., Jr. & Miller, K., et. al. *Public Guardianship and the Elderly.* Cambridge, MA: Ballinger, 1980.

Schutz, H.G., Baird, P.C., & Hawkes, G.R. *Lifestyles and Consumer Behavior of Older Americans.* New York: Praeger, 1977.

Stanford, E.P. *Policy Implications for Hispanic Elderly.* San Diego, CA: Campanile Press, forthcoming.

III. TELEVISION STATIONS THAT FEATURED AoA-FUNDED RESEARCH

Baltimore, MD -- Channel 11
Baltimore, MD -- WBFF, Channel 45
Baltimore, MD -- WBAL(NBC), "Hello, Baltimore" program
Bethesda, MD -- Channel 20, "Newsprobe" program
Canada -- Canadian Broadcasting Corporation
Los Angeles, CA -- ABC News
Los Angeles, CA -- CBS News
New York, NY -- NBC News
New York, NY -- CBS News
New York, NY -- NBC, "Prime Time Saturday" program
New York, NY -- NBC, "Prime of Your Life" program
Sacramento, CA -- "Sacramento Magazine" program
Washington, DC -- D.C. Education Television, "Never Give Up"
Washington, DC -- WDVM (CBS), "Morningbreak" program
Washington, DC -- WRC (CBS), "Sunday Supplement" program
National -- NBC, "Quincy" program
National -- Newsweek Broadcasting, "Today's Woman" program

IV. NEWSPAPERS THAT FEATURED AoA-FUNDED RESEARCH

Associated Press
United Press International
Ann Arbor News
Baltimore *Sunday Sun*
Christian Science Monitor
Columbia, Missouri *Daily Tribune*
Columbia, Missouri *Times*
Detroit Free Press
Ellicott City, Maryland *Times*
Kansas City Star
Miami Herald
New York Times
Oregonian
Oregon Journal
Prince George's Journal
Sacramento Observer
Tampa Tribune
Washington Post
Washington Star

V. PROJECTS THAT RECEIVED TELEVISION AND RADIO COVERAGE

- Reducing the Effects of Crime Against the Elderly (93P75190)
- Maltreatment and Abuse of the Elderly (90A1664)
- The Battered Elder Syndrome (90A1674)
- Incentives and Family Environments for the Elderly (90A316)
- Individual and Community Competence: A Study of the Successfulness of Coping Mechanisms of the Aged (90A520)
- Life Styles of the Aging and Consumer Behavior (90A645)

- Yoga and Relaxation--Meditation as Preventive Health Care for Black, Hispanic, and White Older Persons (90AR2056)

- Conceptualizing Quality Terminal Care for the Elderly (90AR2063)

- Retirement Age Policies and Employment Opportunities (90A1739)

- Funding Practices, Policies, and Performance of State and Area Agencies: A Study of the Correlates of Senior Power, Environmental, and Organizational Variables (90A979)

- The Minority Retiree: An Untapped Resource (90AR2108)

- The Impact of Suburbanization on the Needs of Older Americans (90A1366)

VI. THE PROJECTS THAT PRODUCED OR HAVE BEEN THE BASIS OF NEWSPAPER ARTICLES

- Home Health Care Among the Black Elderly (90A1291)

- Informal Social Networks in Support of Elderly Blacks in the Black Belt of the U.S. (90A1290)

- Techniques of Social Service Provision to the Minority Aged (90A1298)

- Aging with Television (90A1299)

- Aged and Pre-Aged Women: Analysis of Needs (90A1015)

- American Values and the Elderly (90A1325)

- The Impact of Suburbanization on the Needs of Older Americans (90A1366)

- The Battered Elder Syndrome (90A1674)

- Retirement Age Policies and Employment Opportunities (90A1739)
- A Study of Programs Affecting the Elderly as Constituents: A National Aging Policy (90A660)
- Yoga and Relaxation--Meditation and Preventive Health Care for Black, Hispanic, and White Older Persons (90AR2056)
- Impact of Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 on Nursing Home Integration in Three East Coast States (90AR2072)
- Reducing the Effects of Crime Against the Elderly (90P75190)
- Multidisciplinary Center of Gerontology (90A1234)